	Page 1
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
2	NORFOLK DIVISION
3	
4	CSX TRANSPORTATION, INC.,
	individually and on behalf of
5	NORFOLK & PORTSMOUTH BELT LINE
	RAILROAD COMPANY,
6	
	Plaintiff,
7	CIVIL ACTION FILE
	VS.
8	NO. 2:18cv530
	NORFOLK SOUTHERN RAILWAY
9	COMPANY, NORFOLK & PORTSMOUTH
	BELT LINE RAILROAD COMPANY,
10	JERRY HALL, THOMAS HURLBUT,
	PHILIP MERILLI, and CANNON
11	MOSS,
12	Defendants.
13	
14	VIDEO DEPOSITION OF
15	JAMES ALLAN
16	March 13, 2020
17	9:36 a.m. EXHIBIT
18	McGuireWoods LLP 48
19	1230 Peachtree Street
20	Suite 2100
21	Atlanta, Georgia
22	Robyn Bosworth, RPR, CRR, CRC, CCR-B-2138

800-567-8658 973-410-4098

Page 93

them to all provide their traffic that was going to move in the Norfolk area, the route, you know, available to it because one party could more efficiently serve it than all the individual roads themselves trying to build in and have duplicative structures.

1

2.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

The entity was not designed to be a profit center for those roads. It was -- the 6 percent is more around a fair and equitable return on capital that the roads would put in, but they all had access to it, and it was about cost efficiencies.

Q So the mission of NPBL, unlike CSX and Norfolk Southern, it was supposed to be a sustaining entity that could return a dividend to its owners, but its mission wasn't to make as much profit as possible.

Is that a fair characterization?

A I think so because it wasn't meant to advantage or disadvantage any of the members. They were supposed to be agnostic to ownership and not beholden to one owner versus another.

Q And as far as a financial -- as far as the

Page 94 financial goals of the entity, it wasn't supposed to 1 be -- NPBL's mission wasn't to make as much money as 2. possible, it was -- its goal was to hit that 3 6 percent dividend to its owners? The charter was around returning that 5 6 percent, which was a nominal but a return, right. 6 7 Like, if it was doubling, you know, their 8 expenses -- if they were charging, you know, 100X 9 for something that cost them 40X, that would 10 certainly not be in the spirit of what the owners originally agreed to. 11 12 Right. Q 13 And as a point of comparison, the two -last two companies you've worked for, Fiserv and 14 15 CSX, their missions are to make as much money and 16 profit as possible and return value to shareholders, 17 correct, as much as possible in a generic sense? 18 Α It's a component, right. 19 Q Right. 20 I think you serve the community, you Α serve, you know, your shareholders, you serve your 2.1 employees. 22

Page 117 And I think you and I -- or at least you 1 answered that you thought this was somewhere in 2 between a profit-centric company and the Boys & 3 Girls Club? 4 5 Α Yes. Okay. 6 Q 7 Α Closer to the Boys & Girls Club, but yes. 8 Q Okay. 9 Α That's the 6 percent, right, like if 10 you --11 I don't know if you noticed that the Boys Q 12 & Girls Club building is right here --13 MR. MCFARLAND: Headquarters. 14 BY MR. LYNCH: 15 -- headquarters is here. So... 16 They actually just sold the -- or 17 they're in the process of selling the property for 18 not Boys & Girls Club prices. 19 Q Okay. Well, it's a good location here in 20 Atlanta. 2.1 So looking at what Donna Coleman said under item 125A, do you have any thoughts, you know, 22

```
Page 190
     that I believe is consistent with what you were
1
     telling us about -- if you can pass that up.
 2.
                (Defendant's Exhibit 17 was marked for
 3
     identification.)
     BY MR. SNOW:
 5
               So what I've just shown you is a series of
 6
     two e-mails. It's Bates labeled at the bottom
 7
8
     CSXT 8295. And I'll concede that you are not one of
9
     the recipients or the people sending the e-mail, but
10
     I believe you're mentioned in the body.
11
               The top one, if you see, it's dated
12
     April 21st, 2010, and it's from Fredrik Eliasson.
13
               Do you recognize that name?
14
          Α
               I do.
               Okay. Who is Fredrik Eliasson?
15
16
               He was one of the board members on NPBL.
17
     I mean, I -- how long of a soliloguy do you want?
     Like, I mean, he was a --
18
19
          Q
               Well, he was an appointee by CSXT, wasn't
20
     he --
2.1
          Α
               Yeah.
22
               -- on the --
          0
```

Page 191 He was one of CSXT's board member 1 2 representatives. On the Belt Line's board? 3 0 Α Yes, sorry. 4 5 Okay. And it's to Donna Coleman, and there's a cc to Jake Allison. 6 7 Do you know who Jake Allison is? 8 Α He was one of the appointees to the board 9 representing Norfolk Southern. 10 O Okay. So this is an e-mail from Fredrik 11 Eliasson, the CSX board member, to Donna Coleman 12 with a cc to Jake Allison, the NS board member. 13 Is that fair? That's what it -- what it shows. 14 Α 15 16 17 18 19 20 2.1 22



